



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,607	03/25/2004	Hak-goo Lee	1793.1175	5024
21171 7590 01/10/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER BOAKYE, ALEXANDER O	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,607	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEXANDER BOAKYE	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12, 14 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 13, 15 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davies (US Patent # 7,161,897).

Regarding claim 15, Davies teaches a method (Fig. 4), comprising: automatically setting a domain name service (DNS) server address of a node by searching the domain name service server on a network using a node discovery process of a DNS server side router and a predetermined dynamic routing protocol of the DNS server side router (column 13, lines 23-32).

Regarding claim 18, Davies teaches a method, (Fig. 4) comprising: dynamically searching a position of a domain name service (DNS) server (106,120,122,124) connected to the Internet (102) using a predetermined routing protocol by informing link state information of the DNS server (106,120,122,124) to all routers connected to a network to transmit the position information of the DNS server to predetermined hosts

Art Unit: 2616

which ask the position of the DNS server, thereby automatically setting an address of the DNS server on the predetermined hosts (column 2, lines 45-48 and column 14, lines 31-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 13, 15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US Patent # 7,161,897) in view of Weinstein et al. (US Patent # 6,977,937).

Regarding claims 10, Davies teaches a method of advertising information on a domain name service server the method comprising (Fig. 4): storing (column 15, lines 61-64) according to a predetermined dynamic routing protocol, link state information of a router (104) which has a domain name service server (106,120, 122,124 of Fig.4) in a network subnet to which the router belongs; domain name service server (106,120,122,124 of Fig.4) in the router subnet (104) , and stored to all routers within an autonomous system to which the router belongs, of the predetermined dynamic routing

protocol (column 2, lines 45-48). Davies differs from the claimed invention in that Davies does not disclose link state advertisement of the router, flooding procedure. However, Weinstein teaches link state advertisement of the router and flooding procedure (column 2, lines 1-19 and column 3, lines 27-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davies to include the feature of link state advertisement of the router and flooding procedure such as the one taught by Weinstein with motivation being that it provides reduction of the amount of protocol traffic.

Regarding claim 13, Davies teaches a computer-readable recording medium having thereon a program for executing a method of advertising information on a domain name service server, the method comprising:) storing (column 15, lines 61-64) according to a predetermined dynamic routing protocol, link state information of a router (104) which has a domain name service server (106,120, 122,124 of Fig.4) in a network subnet to which the router belongs; domain name service server (106,120,122,124 of Fig.4) in the router subnet (104) , and stored to all routers within an autonomous system to which the router belongs, of the predetermined dynamic routing protocol (column 2, lines 45-48).

Davies differs from the claimed invention in that Davies does not disclose link state advertisement of the router, flooding procedure. However, Weinstein teaches link state advertisement of the router and flooding procedure (column 2, lines 1-19 and column 3, lines 27-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davies to include the feature of link state advertisement of the router and flooding procedure such as the one taught by Weinstein with motivation being that it provides reduction of the amount of protocol traffic.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US Patent # 7,161,897) as applied to claim 10 above and in view of Weinstein et al. (US Patent # 6,977,937) and further in view of Kwiatkowski (US Patent # 7,245,640).

Regarding claim 11, Davies as modified by Weinstein teaches all the claimed limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 above, but fails to explicitly teach that the predetermined dynamic routing protocol is an open shortest path first dynamic routing protocol. However Kwiatkowski discloses that the predetermined dynamic routing protocol is an open shortest path first dynamic routing protocol (column 2, lines 40-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kwiatkowski into the

system of Davies as modified by Weinstein in order to compute the reachability of the destinations coupled to network.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-9, 14, 12, 19 are allowable

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As to claims 1-9 and 14, the prior art of record does not teach advertising by the requesting router having received the reply, a router advertisement message containing the address of the domain name service server to a subnet to which the requesting router having received the reply belongs, thereby searching a location of the domain name service server on the network using the predetermined dynamic routing protocol.

As to claims 12, the prior art of record does not teach advertising by the requesting router having received the reply, a router advertisement message containing the address of the domain name service server to a subnet to which the requesting router having received the reply belongs, thereby searching a location of the domain name service server on the network using the predetermined dynamic routing protocol. As to claim 19, the prior art of record does not teach advertising by the requesting router having received the reply, a router advertisement message containing the address of the domain name service server to a subnet to which the requesting router having

received the reply belongs, thereby searching a location of the domain name service server on the network using the predetermined dynamic routing protocol.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Boakye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3183. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham, can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The Fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

Art Unit: 2616

should be directed to the **Electronic Business Center (EBC)** numbers at 866-217-9197 and 703-305-3028.

Alexander Boakye

Patent Examiner

AB

01/05/08



CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

1/7/08